REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed November 9, 2004, the Examiner has rejected all of the pending claims 1-24. Applicants have cancelled claims 1-22 and have added new claims 25-46. Thus, in view of the foregoing, claims 23-46 are pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-20 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2001/0037325, by Biderman, *et al.* (hereinafter Biderman) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,487,641, issued to Cusson *et al.* (hereinafter Cusson). Applicants have cancelled these claims. Therefore, the rejection with respect to these claims is moot.

New claims 25-46 have been added. According to the present invention as defined by the new claims, after having received search requests from more than one of the user terminals one after another, for example, the search-performing apparatus returns a result of a search to a relevant user terminal within approximately the same time period that it would take if the search had been conducted with only one user terminal. *See* Specification, page 3, lines 6-19.

The above feature is accomplished by the present invention which includes a pattern-search system including a pattern search performing apparatus. The apparatus searches through data constituting a search target wherein the data of the search target consists of data sets each being separated into portions respectively identified by a series of item names that apply commonly to all data sets constituting the data of the search target. The search-pattern according to the present invention includes item identification codes (also referred to as item tags) and search words (words to be retrieved). The search-pattern-variable table correlates all item tags and the search words stored in the search-condition buffer with relevant variables that make the item tags and search words the associated values. *See* Specification, page 4, line 13 - page 6, line 4.

Thus, new independent claims 25, 30, 35, 40, 41, and 46 of the present invention recite:

> a search-query-formula-variable table containing and correlating . .
>
> a first search-query formula describing the search-pattern in a form using the first variable and
> a second variable that makes the first search-query formula the associated value and further correlating the terminal apparatus identifier with a second search-query-formula describing the first search-query-formula-in a form using the second variable and

the second variable that makes the first search-query-formula the associated value

. *See*, for example, claim 26.

Applicants respectfully submit that the new claims are patentable over Biderman in view of Cusson. Biderman does not teach or suggest the features of the present invention, as identified by the above-quoted language of the claims. Biderman is directed to a computer implemented method and system for allowing a first web surfer to locate at least one web server having similar navigation and/or search strategies, wherein a web server in connection with the first and second web surfers receives key words and/or Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) derived by parsing respective navigation strings from all web surfers in communication with the web server.

In contrast to the present invention, Biderman merely discloses that for each selected search engine, a web server constructs an appropriate navigation pattern, which includes Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) and keywords. The keywords are then transmitted to a primary database server and are added to a search database. Thus, Biderman is not directed to a method or way of performing a search. Rather, according to Biderman, a search string is parsed to extract keywords, which are merely gathered to compile a database of keywords of various web surfers in order to locate web surfers having a similar search strategy. *See* Biderman, page 5, paragraph 63. *See also* Biderman, FIG. 4B. Biderman does not provide any specific details relating to *how* the keyword search itself is conducted. For example, Biderman does not teach or suggest a search-query-formula-variable table containing and correlating a first search-query formula describing the search-pattern in a form using a first variable, as in the present invention.

Likewise, Cusson is not directed to a method for searching for keywords. In other words, Cusson is not concerned with *how* a keyword search is conducted. Rather, Cusson is directed toward a middle-tier web server with a queryable cache that contains items from one or more data sources. According to Cusson, it allows a query to a database server that results in a cache miss to occur substantially as fast as a query that goes directly to a database server. *See* Cusson, column 4, lines 18-21. According to Cusson, this is accomplished by adding a "miss table" to a cache that contains copies of remotely stored items. If a copy of the item is not in the cache, the remotely stored item is fetched. Thus, Cusson is concerned with reducing the "cost" of the miss in the cache and does not disclose or suggest a search-query-formula-variable table containing and correlating a first search-query formula describing the search-pattern in a form using a first variable, as in the present invention.

Therefore, the present invention is patentable over Biderman in view of Cusson, as neither Biderman nor Cusson, taken alone, or in combination, teaches or suggests the element of the claims discussed above.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentable over Biderman in view of Cusson and further in view of Sundaresan, as none of the references, taken alone, or in combination teaches or suggests the element of the claims discussed above.

Sundaresan is directed toward a system for transforming XML documents into other XML documents using a pattern matching technology. More specifically, as admitted by the Examiner, Sundaresan is concerned with a method for performing pattern matching and document transformation and does not include any disclosure or suggestion regarding searching for keywords. For example, when a pattern match occurs, a transformation rule specification identifies one or more transformations of the document to be performed.

New claims 26-29, 31-34, 36-39 and 41-44 depend from the independent claims and are thus patentable over the references for at least the reason offered above with respect to the independent claims.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected claims 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Biderman. Applicants respectfully submit that newly amended claims 23-24 are patentable over Biderman, as Biderman does not teach each and every element of the claims. For example, Biderman fails to disclose, "receiving plural character string text search requests including corresponding search variables" and "combining the requests into a combined retrieval pattern including the search variables of the requests," as recited in claims 23-24. As previously mentioned, unlike the present invention, Biderman is not directed toward *how* a search is performed.

Assuming *arguendo* that it is, however, Biderman's web server receives a search string from the client as well as a list of search engines for effecting simultaneous searches. For *each* selected search engine, the webserver constructs an appropriate navigation pattern, which includes URL and keywords. *See* Biderman, page 5, paragraph 63. In the present invention, a plurality of requests including character strings are received from a plurality of user terminals and combined. Biderman receives a search string from a client and a list of search engines. But the search string from the client is not combined with the search string from the list of search engines. Rather, the combination of the URL and keyword is combined for each selected

search engine in Biderman. In other words, information from the search engine is not combined with information from the client. Therefore, newly amended claims 23-24 are patentable over Biderman for at least the reason offered above.

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103(a) and are therefore allowable. An early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2-9-05

By: _____
John C. Garvey
Registration No. 28,607

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501